

Coherence by environmental decoherence in the damped and dephased Jaynes-Cummings models

JUAN MAURICIO TORRES¹ and THOMAS H. SELIGMAN^{2,3}

¹ *Institut für Angewandte Physik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, D-64289, Germany*

² *Instituto de Ciencias Físicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Cuernavaca, Morelos, México*

³ *Centro Internacional de Ciencias A. C., Cuernavaca, Morelos, México*

PACS 03.65.Yz – Decoherence; open systems

PACS 42.50.Pq – Cavity quantum electrodynamics

Abstract – We study two extensions to the Jaynes Cummings model described by Markovian master equations with Lindblad operators causing either dephasing or photon losses solely involving the cavity mode. We treat the two-level atom as the central system under investigation, while the mode of the cavity plays the role of a near environment coupled via the Lindblad operators to an imagined far environment. We show that increasing the dephasing or damping parameter of the cavity systematically slows the decoherence of the atom. The exact solvability allows us to determine the relation to the quantum Zeno effect and the perturbative regime.

Introduction. – The loss of coherence in quantum systems is one of the major obstacles to overcome in order to achieve effective quantum communication technologies and quantum computation implementations [1]. The main source of decoherence is the environment to which the system under investigation couples invariably. Recently there has been a surge of interest in using the coherence loss of the “near” environment of a central quantum system to stabilize the coherence of the latter. This reaches from the limit of very fast decoherence of the near environment [2], which may actually lead in some limit to a protected subspace for the central system, all the way to perturbative treatments where all couplings are small [3,4]. Numerical results for spin systems [5] and random matrix environments [3] seem to support such improvement through the range of coupling strength. In all cases there seems to exist options to improve coherence of the central system considerably if it is already quite good to start with. Indeed it so seems, that weak coupling of the central system to the near environment is the only prerequisite for this method to be workable. It provides a practical alternative to dynamical decoupling or topologically protected decoherence free subspaces and other methods to extend coherence times.

The purpose of this work is to investigate this problem in two paradigmatic, simple, and exactly solvable models in quantum optics: A Jaynes-Cummings model with dephasing and a damped Jaynes-Cummings model. Thereby,

the dephasing and the damping mechanisms are assumed to act solely on the cavity mode. The role of central system is played by a two-level atom which is coupled to a single mode of an optical cavity acting as the near environment. Decoherence of the cavity is taken into account to mimic the effects of a far environment. We assume that the two types of decoherence mechanisms in the cavity which can be described in terms of a Markovian master equation in Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan-Lindblad form [6,7]. In a first approach we consider a dephasing model, with the number operator as Lindblad operator. This may not be very realistic, but it will turn out to be most illustrative due to its simple analytical treatment and the absence of competing effects: The Liouville operator can be expressed in terms of disconnected 4×4 matrices. In a second case, photon losses are considered by choosing the annihilation operator as Lindblad operator. This case can be connected to the standard setting in the Haroche experiment [8]. For both cases, we have worked out analytical expressions of the reduced density matrix of the atom and its purity to measure the decoherence of the central system. We find that in the strong coupling limit of the cavity to the outside world, the atomic state remains pure, i.e., it evolves coherently in time. For the damping case we find this to be an excellent illustration for the improved conservation of Energy in the qubit which is in line with known results [9]. The simple fact that we do get exact solutions in a special but non trivial case of a rather complicated sys-

tem is of great interest, as it will allow us to gain insight in possible mechanisms of behaviours encountered. It may be noted that a number of special cases of this system as well as particular situations in similar systems have been studied. We shall return to some of these cases during the discussion. We shall start by briefly defining the model and then proceed to discuss the simpler case, where the Lindblad operator is the number operator of the harmonic mode (which can be interpreted as dephasing of the oscillator); this we will do, despite of the fact that it is less realistic than a loss term, because it is very transparent. Next we will address the case of photon losses in the cavity in which the annihilation operator of the oscillator is considered as Lindblad operator. Finally we shall discuss to what extent our considerations may shed light into known numerical and random matrix results [3–5], and discuss in what ways the basic result can be used to help control coherence.

The model. – The Jaynes-Cummings (JC) model describes the interaction between a two-level atom with one mode of the electromagnetic field inside an optical cavity [10]. The Hamiltonian in the interaction picture with respect to the electromagnetic field energy is given by ($\hbar = 1$)

$$H = \delta\sigma^+\sigma^- + g(a\sigma^+ + a^\dagger\sigma^-), \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma^\pm$ are the raising and lowering operators of the two-level atom acting on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{at}} = \mathbb{C}^2$, while a and $a^\dagger$ are the cavity mode creation and annihilation operators that act on the Fock space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cav}} = F_+(\mathbb{C})$ [11]. The complete Hilbert space is therefore the tensor product of the composite Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{at}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{cav}}$. The parameter g is the interaction strength between the two-level atom and the cavity. The detuning of the atomic transition frequency from the frequency of the mode is represented by δ . A general state of the system can be represented by the density matrix ρ that is also an operator acting on $\mathcal{H}$. Its Hamiltonian dynamics is governed by the von Neumann equation $\dot{\rho} = -i[H, \rho]$. We introduce decoherence effects in the system by adding the action on ρ of the generator $\mathcal{D}[x]$ defined in Lindblad form as

$$\mathcal{D}[x]\rho = x\rho x^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}(x^\dagger x\rho + \rho x^\dagger x). \quad (2)$$

The Lindblad operator x could in principle be chosen to act on the complete Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. However, in this work we restrict ourselves to operators x acting solely on the Hilbert space of the cavity $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cav}}$.

Dephasing of the cavity. – Let us start our discussion by considering a situation that involves a dephasing mechanism in the cavity but without any loss of excitations. The dynamics of a model that includes this effect in the cavity can be described by the following master equation

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}_d\rho = -i[H, \rho] + \kappa\mathcal{D}[a^\dagger a]\rho \quad (3)$$

depending on the dissipator of Eq (2) with the Lindblad operator $x = a^\dagger a$ which describes the dephasing of the cavity. An important property of the Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}_d$ is that it conserves the number of excitations of the operator $a^\dagger a + \sigma_+ \sigma_-$. Therefore, if one considers initial states of the form $|e, n-1\rangle = |e\rangle \otimes |n-1\rangle$, that is an excited atom and $n-1$ photons in the cavity, the time dependent density matrix of the system can be expressed as

$$\rho(t) = v_1|g, n\rangle\langle g, n| + v_2|g, n\rangle\langle e, n-1| + v_3|e, n-1\rangle\langle g, n| + v_4|e, n-1\rangle\langle e, n-1|. \quad (4)$$

The time dependent coefficients are solution of the differential equation $\dot{\vec{v}} = L\vec{v}$, where $\vec{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)^\top$ is a column vector and L is a matrix that can be obtained from the Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}_d$ and has the explicit form

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & ig\sqrt{n} & -ig\sqrt{n} & 0 \\ ig\sqrt{n} & -\kappa + i\delta & 0 & -ig\sqrt{n} \\ -ig\sqrt{n} & 0 & -\kappa - i\delta & ig \\ 0 & -ig\sqrt{n} & ig\sqrt{n} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

Actually, the matrix L is one of many disconnected blocks that form the Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}_d$ [12]. As it is a 4×4 matrix, solution to the eigenvalue equation of L can always be calculated in analytical form. However, the expressions are lengthy and not very elucidating. For this reason, we concentrate ourselves on the resonant case, i.e., $\delta = 0$. In this case the four eigenvalues of L are given by

$$\lambda_0 = 0, \quad \lambda_1 = -\kappa, \quad \lambda_{\pm}^{(n)} = \frac{-\kappa \pm \sqrt{\kappa^2 - 16g^2n}}{2}. \quad (6)$$

These four eigenvalues of L form part of the complete spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_d$. We are particularly interested in the coupled dynamics between atom and cavity for increasing values of the dephasing parameter κ . Therefore, we choose to analyze the eigenvalues by expanding them in terms of the dimensionless parameter

$$\eta_n = 16g^2n/\kappa^2 \quad (7)$$

that appears in the radical of Eq. (6). Such expansion leads to the expression

$$\lambda_{\pm}^{(n)} = -\frac{1 \mp 1}{2}\kappa - \frac{1}{4}\kappa\eta_n + \mathcal{O}[\eta_n^2]. \quad (8)$$

The parameter η_n is a rescaled interaction strength between atom and cavity and tends to zero for increasing values of κ and finite values of g and the photon number n . It follows from the expansion in Eq. (8) that the eigenvalues of L , which are also eigenvalues of the Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}_d$, are insensitive to the coupling strength for sufficiently large values of the photon decay rate κ . This is already an indication that the atomic system is “protected” from the presence of the cavity by the dephasing mechanism.




Fig. 1: Top (bottom) plot: atomic purity $P(t)$ (excited state population $p_e(t)$) as a function of time in units of $1/g$ for different value of the cavity's dephasing parameter κ . The initial state is an excited atom and an empty cavity subject to the dynamics of Eq. (3). Dotted line $\kappa/g = 1$, dotted-dashed line $\kappa/g = 10$, dashed line $\kappa/g = 100$, and full line $\kappa/g = 1000$. Detuning is $\delta/g = 0$.

Now we turn our attention to the dynamical properties of the atomic sub-system. By solving the differential equation and tracing over the photonic degree of freedom, one can evaluate the atomic density matrix which is diagonal in this case and is given by

$$\rho_{\text{at}}(t) = \frac{1}{2} [1 - h_n(t)] |g\rangle\langle g| + \frac{1}{2} [1 + h_n(t)] |e\rangle\langle e|, \quad (9)$$

where we have considered the complex function

$$h_n(t) = \frac{\eta_n e^{\lambda_+^{(n)} t}}{2\eta_n + 4\lambda_+^{(n)}/\kappa} + \frac{\eta_n e^{\lambda_-^{(n)} t}}{2\eta_n + 4\lambda_-^{(n)}/\kappa}. \quad (10)$$

In the limit of $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$, the first term tends to 1 while the second tends to zero. This can be noted by taking into account the form of $\lambda_{\pm}^{(n)}$ in Eq. (8) and of η_n in Eq. (7). Therefore, in this limiting case the probability of finding the atom in the excited state

$$p_e(t) = \text{Tr}\{\sigma^+ \sigma^- \rho_{\text{at}}(t)\} = 1 - h_n(t) \quad (11)$$

freezes at unit value. One can also consider purity of the atomic state. For this quantity one finds

$$P(t) = \text{Tr}\{\rho_{\text{at}}^2(t)\} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\eta_n e^{-\kappa t} + f_n^+(t) + f_n^-(t)}{4(1 - \eta)},$$

$$f_n^{\pm}(t) = \left(1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \eta_n} - \frac{\eta_n}{2}\right) e^{-\kappa(1 \mp \sqrt{1 \pm \eta_n})t}. \quad (12)$$

In the limit when $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ the purity tends to one, as it can be shown that $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} f_n^{\pm}(t) = 1 \pm 1$.

In figure 1 we have plotted the purity $P(t)$ and atomic excitation probability $p_e(t)$ for different values of the dephasing parameter κ . The stationary state of the atomic sub-system is the totally mixed state. This explains the drop of purity as a function of time and the asymptotic value $1/2$ of the excitation probability. However, the basic effect is evident, for increasing values of κ the purity and excitation probability have a slower decay. Closer inspection shows that the two quantities are, in this case, closely related as p_e has to take the value $1/2$ for purity to reach the minimal value of $1/2$.

Photon losses. – Perhaps a more common and realistic scenario is the case of photon losses from the cavity. This effect can be also be incorporated by describing the dynamics in terms of the Lindblad master equation

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}_1 \rho = -i[H, \rho] + \kappa \mathcal{D}[a]\rho. \quad (13)$$

Here we have used again the dissipator defined in Eq. (2), but in this case we have considered the Lindblad operator $x = a$ which describes the damping mechanism due to photon losses in the cavity. The diagonalization of the Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}_1$ in Eq. (13) allows to evaluate the time evolution of any given initial state. It was noted in Ref. [12] that this procedure can be based on the diagonalization of the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $K = H - i\kappa a^\dagger a/2$ which has the following eigenvalues

$$\varepsilon_j^{(n)} = \frac{2\delta - i(2n-1)\kappa}{4} + (-1)^j \sqrt{g^2 n + \frac{(2\delta + i\kappa)^2}{16}}, \quad (14)$$

with $j = 1, 2$ for $n > 0$, and $j = 1$ for $n = 0$. Actually, the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_1$ are given by the simple addition of two eigenvalues of K , i.e., $-i(\varepsilon_j^{(n)} - \varepsilon_k^{(m)*})$, where two additional indices k and m are required [12]. Therefore, analyzing the eigenvalues of K implies doing the same for the Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}_1$. The form of the solution is similar to the eigenvalues of Eq. (6) and a similar expansion to the one in Eq. (8) can be performed. In this way one is able to analyze the eigenvalues as an expansion in terms of a rescaled interaction strength $\chi_n = 16g^2 n / (2\delta + i\kappa)^2$ that appears in the radical of Eq. (14) and is analogue to η_n in the dephasing example. This procedure leads to the following expression

$$\varepsilon_j^{(n)} = -i \frac{n\kappa}{2} + \frac{2\delta + i\kappa}{2} \left(\delta_{j,2} + \frac{(-1)^j}{4} \chi_n + \mathcal{O}[\chi_n^2] \right) \quad (15)$$

where $\delta_{i,2}$ is the Kronecker delta and $j = 1, 2$ for $n > 0$, $j = 1$ for $n = 0$. It can be noted that the parameter




Fig. 2: Top (bottom) plot: atomic purity $P(t)$ (excited state population $p_e(t)$) as a function of time in units of $1/g$ for different values of the cavity decay rate κ . The initial state is an excited atom and an empty cavity subject to the dynamics of Eq. (13). Dotted line $\kappa/g = 1$, dotted-dashed line $\kappa/g = 10$, dashed line $\kappa/g = 100$, and full line $\kappa/g = 1000$. Detuning is $\delta/g = 0.8$.

χ_n tends to zero with increasing values of κ if g , n and δ remain finite. Therefore it follows from the expansion in Eq. (15) that the eigenvalues of the Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}_1$ are insensitive to the coupling strength for sufficiently large values of the photon decay rate κ . In this case we also get an indication that the atomic system is “protected” from the cavity, this time due to photon losses. The result holds for arbitrary values of excitation number n and in this case for all the eigenvalues of the Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}_1$ as they are a sum of two eigenvalues of Eq. (14). We remark that in the case of photon losses, detuning can also be taken into account thanks to the simple diagonalization of $\mathcal{L}_1$ that breaks down to the diagonalization of 2×2 matrices.

Let us now study the dynamical features of the atomic sub-system. Using the approach of Ref. [12], it is possible to evaluate the eigensystem of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and in turn to calculate the time evolution of, in principle, any given initial condition. For the sake of simplicity, we consider the case where only one excitation is present in the system. Details of the

calculations can be found in the Appendix. We assume an arbitrary pure state of the atom and an empty cavity in the Fock state $|0\rangle$. The initial condition is then given by

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = (c_g|g\rangle + c_e|e\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (16)$$

The corresponding reduced density matrix of the atomic sub-system for this particular initial state is found to be

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{at}}(t) = & (1 - |c_e f(t)|^2) |g\rangle\langle g| + |c_e f(t)|^2 |e\rangle\langle e| \\ & + c_e c_g^* f(t) |e\rangle\langle g| + c_e^* c_g f^*(t) |g\rangle\langle e| \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

with the complex function

$$f(t) = \frac{4g^2 e^{-i\varepsilon_2^{(1)}t} + (i\kappa + 2\varepsilon_1^{(1)})^2 e^{-i\varepsilon_1^{(1)}t}}{4g^2 + (i\kappa + 2\varepsilon_1^{(1)})^2}. \quad (18)$$

It can be shown that $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \infty} f(t) = 1$. Therefore, in this limit the atom remains in the excited state as can be noted from Eq. (17) by evaluating the population of the atomic excited state

$$p_e(t) = \text{Tr} \{ \sigma^+ \sigma^- \rho_{\text{at}}(t) \} = |c_e f(t)|^2. \quad (19)$$

By tracing the square of the atomic density matrix one can find that the atomic purity as a function of time is given by the expression

$$P(t) = 1 + 2|c_e|^4 |f(t)|^2 (|f(t)|^2 - 1). \quad (20)$$

This form makes evident that the atom remains pure for longer times as κ increases.

Figure 2 shows the purity $P(t)$ and excited state population $p_e(t)$ of the atom as a function of time for different values of the decay parameter κ . The asymptotic behaviour is explained by the knowledge of the steady state, which is the atom in the ground state and the empty cavity. This is due to the photon losses that drain all excitations in the system. This asymptotic steady state is actually a pure state and this is the reason for the re-emergence of the purity for large values of the interaction time. The excitation probability drops to zero to never revive also in accordance with the steady state involving the atom in the ground state. The important feature is, however, that all of this happens at larger time scales with increasing values of the photon losses κ . This means that very strong coupling of the cavity to its environment protects and freezes the atomic state, a manifestation of the quantum Zeno effect.

Conclusions. – With the dephasing Lindblad operator we have a very simple example, where we can see the entire development of decoherence as a function of time for different parameters. The scaling behaviour is readily established and we see, that the same equation describes the improvement of decoherence from the perturbative all the way to the strong coupling regime, as could be hoped from the rather general analytic results implicit in references [2] and [3, 4]. Yet in the perturbative regime for

κ it seemed that for chaotic environments in the Fermi golden rule regime, i.e. with exponential coherence decay the effect of the far environment was no longer noticeable. The latter effect is not seen in our system. For the case of loss we will have perfect return to a pure state both if the loss sends the central system to the ground state and if a Zeno effect preserves the excitation of the oscillator and thus makes it impossible for this system to absorb energy from the central system. We thus see, that while the same equation governs the system, the qualitative explanation using the quantum Zeno effect will only describe the strong coupling limit, as for weak coupling we have complete decoherence and later recoherence while there is a transition to another state. This is manifested in the purity as an oscillatory behaviour that precludes the interpretation as a quantum Zeno effect; this is in agreement with the findings of [3]. There the protection of coherence by decoherence of the environment was shown in a weak coupling regime by linear response considerations, which also preclude a quantum Zeno effect. Thus our two simple models go a long way in explaining what is going on in the matter of decoherence of a near environment protecting the central system. Yet, as is to be expected some aspects of more realistic systems are not covered by the model behaviour.

* * *

J.M.T. acknowledges support by the BMBF project Q.com and by the DFG as part of the CRC 1119 CROSS-ING. T.H.S. acknowledges financial support from CONA-CyT research grant 219993 and PAPIIT-DGAPA-UNAM research grant IG100616.

Appendix. — Here we present details of the calculations using the eigensystem of the $\mathcal{L}_1$. The non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $K = H - i\kappa a^\dagger a/2$ can be diagonalized in blocks in the basis $\{|n, j\rangle\}$ with the states

$$\begin{aligned} |n, 1\rangle &= |n\rangle \otimes |g\rangle, \quad n \geq 0 \\ |n, 2\rangle &= |n-1\rangle \otimes |e\rangle, \quad n > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The number state $|n\rangle$ describes a situation of n photons in the cavity, while $|e\rangle$ and $|g\rangle$ stands for the excited and ground state of the atom. The explicit form of the blocks of K is given by

$$K^{(n)} = \begin{pmatrix} -i\frac{n\kappa}{2} & g\sqrt{n} \\ g\sqrt{n} & \frac{2\delta - i(n-1)\kappa}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for $n > 0$ and $K^{(0)} = 0$. The eigenvalues are given in Eq. (14). The diagonalization of the matrices $K^{(n)}$ can be accomplished with the transformation $R^{(n)\top} H^{(n)} R^{(n)}$, with

$$R^{(n)} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_n & -\sin \theta_n \\ \sin \theta_n & \cos \theta_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

with $\theta_n = \arctan \left[(2\varepsilon_1^{(n)} + i n \kappa) / 2g\sqrt{n} \right]$. The right and left eigenvectors of K are given by

$$|r_j^{(n)}\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^2 R_{k,j}^{(n)} |n, k\rangle, \quad \langle q_j^{(n)}| = \sum_{k=1}^2 R_{k,j}^{(n)} \langle n, k| \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for $n > 0$ and the singlet $|0, 1\rangle$ for $n = 0$. It has been shown in Ref. [12] that the full eigensystem of the Liouville operator $\mathcal{L}_1$ in Eq. (13) can be constructed from the eigensystem of the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian K . With the knowledge of the full set of right (left) eigenvectors $\hat{\rho}_\lambda$ ($\check{\rho}_\lambda$) (labeled with the corresponding eigenvalue λ), one is able to evaluate the time evolution of any given initial condition ρ_0 as

$$\rho(t) = e^{\mathcal{L}_1 t} \rho_0 = \sum_{\lambda} \text{Tr} \left\{ \check{\rho}_\lambda^\dagger \rho_0 \right\} e^{\lambda t} \hat{\rho}_\lambda. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

For initial states of the form $|\Psi_0\rangle\langle\Psi_0|$ with the state of the Eq. (16) the only contribution to (A.5) is given by the following set of 7 right and left eigenvectors of $\mathcal{L}_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_{1,1}^{(0,0)} &= |0, 1\rangle\langle 0, 1|, \quad \hat{\rho}_{j,1}^{(1,0)} = |r_j^1\rangle\langle 0, 1|, \\ \hat{\rho}_{j,k}^{(0,1)} &= |r_j^1\rangle\langle r_k^1| - \langle r_k^1 | r_j^1 \rangle |0, 1\rangle\langle 0, 1|, \end{aligned}$$

With left eigenvectors $\check{\rho}_{1,1}^{(0,0)} = \mathbb{I}$, $\check{\rho}_{j,1}^{(1,0)} = |q_j^1\rangle\langle 0, 1| + \dots$ and $\check{\rho}_{j,k}^{(0,1)} = |q_j^1\rangle\langle q_k^1| + \dots$. The dots indicate a series of terms that we omit as they do not contribute for initial states with one excitation in the system. The corresponding eigenvalues are $\lambda_{1,1}^{(0,0)} = 0$, $\lambda_{j,1}^{(1,0)} = -i\varepsilon_j^{(1)}$ and $\lambda_{j,k}^{(0,1)} = -i(\varepsilon_j^{(1)} - \varepsilon_k^{*(1)})$. With this subset of the eigensystem, it is possible to write the time evolution of the initial state in Eq. (16) as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(t) &= |0, 1\rangle\langle 0, 1| + \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \langle q_j^1 | \rho_0 | q_k^1 \rangle e^{\lambda_{j,k}^{(0,1)} t} \hat{\rho}_{j,k}^{(0,1)} \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^2 \left(\langle q_j^1 | \rho_0 | 0, 1 \rangle e^{\lambda_{j,1}^{(1,0)} t} \hat{\rho}_{j,1}^{(1,0)} + \text{h.c.} \right). \end{aligned}$$

with $\rho_0 = |\Psi_0\rangle\langle\Psi_0|$. From Eqs. (16) and (A.4) it follows that $\langle q_j^1 | \Psi_0 \rangle = c_e R_{2,j}^{(1)}$ and $\langle \Psi_0 | 0, 1 \rangle = c_g^*$. By taking this into account and tracing over the photonic degrees of freedom one finds the reduced density matrix of the atomic system

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{at}}(t) &= |g\rangle\langle g| + \sum_{j=1}^2 \left(c_e c_g^* (R_{2,j}^{(1)})^2 e^{\lambda_{j,1}^{(1,0)} t} |e\rangle\langle g| + \text{h.c.} \right) \\ &+ |c_e|^2 \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \left(R_{2,j}^{(1)} R_{2,k}^{(1)*} \right)^2 e^{\lambda_{j,k}^{(0,1)} t} (|e\rangle\langle e| - |g\rangle\langle g|). \end{aligned}$$

The expression in Eq. (17) is obtained by considering

$$f(t) = \sum_{j=1}^2 R_{2,j}^{(1)} e^{-i\varepsilon_j^{(1)} t}.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000).
- [2] P. Zanardi and L. Campos Venuti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**,
- [3] H. J. Moreno, T. Gorin, and T. H. Seligman, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 030104(R) (2015).
- [4] T. Gorin, H. J. Moreno, and T. H. Seligman, arXiv:1509.03596 .
- [5] C. Gonzalez-Gutierrez, E. Villaseñor, C. Pineda, T. H. Seligman, arXiv:1512.07683.
- [6] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, J. Math. Phys. **17**, 821 (1976).
- [7] G. Lindblad, Commun. Math. Phys. **48**, 119 (1976).
- [8] M. Brune, E. Hagley, J. Dreyer, X. Maître, A. Maali, C. Wunderlich, J. M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** 4887 (1996).
- [9] A. R. Bosco de Magalhaes, R. Rossi, Jr., and M. C. Nemes, Phys. Lett. A **375**, 1724 (2011).
- [10] E. Jaynes and F. Cummings, Proc. IEEE **51**, 89 (1963).
- [11] Reinhard Honegger and Alfred Rieckers, *Photons in Fock Space and Beyond, Volume I: From Classical to Quantized Radiation Systems* (World Scientific Publishing Company 2015).
- [12] J.M. Torres, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 052133 (2014).
- [13] H.J. Briegel, B.G. Englert, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 3311 (1993).